REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering Applicant's prior arguments, and entering amendments to the claims. Applicant requests that the Examiner amend claims 1, 9, and 28, and cancel claims 8 and 31. Cancellations of and/or amendments to the claims are not an acquiescence to any of the rejections. Silence with regard to any of the Examiner's rejections is not an acquiescence to such rejections. Specifically, silence with regard to Examiner's rejection of a dependent claim, when such claim depends from an independent claim that Applicant considers allowable for reasons provided herein, is not an acquiescence to such rejection of the dependent claim(s), but rather a recognition by Applicant that such previously lodged rejection is moot based on Applicant's remarks and/or amendments relative to the independent claim (that Applicant considers allowable) from which the dependent claim(s) depends. Furthermore, any cancellations of and amendments to the claims are being made solely to expedite prosecution of the instant application. Applicant reserves the option to further prosecute the same or similar claims in the instant or a subsequent application. Upon entry of the Amendment, as requested by Applicant, claims 1-7, 9-30, and 32-40 are pending in the present application.

Cited References

Filed with this response is PTO Form 1449 including copies of the non-patent references originally cited in the application, and originally requested by the Examiner in paragraph 2 of the office action mailed July 18, 2003. Please note that, regarding the Michalewicz reference, despite the cite to page 12, lines 19-22, page 12 does not exist in the

book. Therefore, Applicant submits the entirety of Chapter 1 of the reference, covering

pages 13-31. Please also note that, regarding the Back et al., eds., reference, no page

numbered 14 exists in the book, and thus Applicant has submitted a copy of the fourteenth

page following the introductory sections. Please further note that, with regards to the Ferber

reference, Applicant has provided the Examiner with a copy of the English translation,

published in 1999, of the original publication in French, published in 1995. Applicant

believes that there have been no additions of material made in the 1999 publication, and that

the 1999 publication is a direct translation of the 1995 publication. Further, please note that

Applicant has provided as much of the Zeigler et al., Banks, Moss et al., and Ferber

references as possible, given that Applicant requested that Applicant's undersigned Attorney

undertake a response to this action only one week prior to the six-month final response

deadline for this action. Thus, given the circumstances mentioned above, both Applicant

and Applicant's undersigned Attorney believe that they have acted in candor and good faith

to fulfill their duty of disclosure as defined in 37 C.F.R. § 1.56, and further that this

submission is part of a *bona fide* attempt to advance the application to a final action, as

required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(b).

Claim Objections

Applicant thanks the Examiner for finding the typographical error in Applicant's

dependent claim 35. Applicant has amended dependent claim 35 to correct the error, and

requests entry of this amendment.

Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected Applicant's claims 1-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,737,581 to Keane in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,897,629

to Shinagawa et al.

Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to include the limitation present in the

former dependent claim 8, now cancelled. Applicant's amended claim 1 requires that

business model descriptions comprise one or more computer-simulateable value

propositions (VP) which describe output values provided by businesses. With regard to this

limitation, the Examiner cited to Keane, col. 5, lines 29-42, as teaching or suggesting this

feature. The cited text describes Keane's consumer model. The Examiner has cited to

Keane's consumer model (as further described at col. 14, line X to col. 15, line X) as

teaching or suggesting Applicant's customer model in Applicant's amended claim 1,

element b. Element b of Applicant's amended claim 1 requires describing a business-model

environment, wherein the *business-model environment* comprises a plurality of computer-

simulateable customer models, wherein the customer models patronize the business models

to receive values from the business models. Applicant makes no comment on whether the

cited consumer model of Keane teaches or suggests Applicant's customer model. However,

it is clear that Keane fails to teach or suggest using the information that comprises Keane's

consumer model as one or more value propositions that are part of the descriptions of the

business models, as required by Applicant's amended claim 1. With regard to the

information, Keane teaches or suggests only that it may be used to comprise a consumer

model; *see, e.g.,* Keane, col. 4, lines 1-18, describing examples of the parameters for each

model, where the parameters of the consumer model are not included in the list of parameters for any other model. Thus, Applicant's amended claim 1 is not suggested or taught by Keane, either alone or in combination with Shinagawa et al., and thus Applicant's amended claim 1 is allowable.

Because Applicant's amended claim 1 is allowable, Applicant's dependent claims 2-7 and 9-14, which depend from amended claim 1, are also allowable.

Applicant has amended independent claim 28 to include the limitation present in the former dependent claim 31, now cancelled. Applicant's amended claim 28 now includes the same limitation found in Applicant's amended claim 1 above, and thus for the reasons given with regards to amended claim 1, amended claim 28 is also allowable. Because Applicant's amended claim 28 is allowable, Applicant's dependent claims 29-30 and 32-33, which depend from amended claim 28, are also allowable.

Applicant's independent claims 15, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, and 40, as previously presented, all include the limitation of one or more computer-simulateable value proposition (VP) building blocks which describe output values provided by businesses, similar to the limitation now present in Applicant's amended claims 1 and 28. Thus, for the reasons given with regards to amended claims 1 and 28, Applicant's independent claims 15, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, and 40 are allowable. Therefore, Applicant's dependent claim 37, which depends from allowable claim 36, is also allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes this Response to be fully responsive to the present Office Action.

Thus, based on the foregoing Remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application

is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests allowance of the application.

Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the Applicant's undersigned Attorney if

any issues are deemed to remain prior to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 20, 2004
Customer No: 25181
Patent Group
Foley Hoag, LLP
155 Seaport Blvd.
Boston, MA 02210-2600

Shaun P. Montana, Reg. No. 54,320
Attorney for Applicant
Tel. No. (617) 832-1245
Fax. No. (617) 832-7000